



26 DEC 2007

21999
KIRTON AND MCCONKIE
60 East South Temple
Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

In re Application of :
DOUGLAS, Paul :
U.S. Application No.: 10/550,035 :
PCT No.: PCT/GB2004/001183 :
Int. Filing Date: 18 March 2004 :
Priority Date: 21 March 2003 :
Attorney Docket No.: 7881.19 :
For: JAW CRUSHER :

DECISION

This decision is in response to the "Petition Under 37 CFR §1.47(b)" and "Petition for Revival . . . Under 37 CFR 1.137(b)" submitted on 23 October 2007.

BACKGROUND

On 02 June 2006, the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) and a \$65.00 surcharge fee was required. Petitioners were given two-months to respond with extensions of time available pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a).

On 23 October 2007, applicant submitted a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) which was accompanied by, *inter alia*, a \$200.00 petition fee; a \$65.00 surcharge fee; a petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b) with fee; and exhibits A - N.

DISCUSSION

The time limit (with extensions) to respond to the Form PCT/DO/EO/905 mailed 02 June 2006 expired on 02 January 2007. No response was filed during this period.

Accordingly, the above-captioned application is hereby **ABANDONED**.

In the instant response filed 23 October 2007, applicant submitted a petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b) and a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b).

Petition to Revive Under 37 CFR 1.137(b)

A petition to revive pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) requires: (1) a proper reply, (2) the petition fee required by law, (3) a statement that the "entire delay in filing the

10/550,035

required reply from the due date for the reply to the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional,” and (4) any terminal disclaimer and fee required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c).

Applicant submitted a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) for the nonsigning inventor along with a \$65.00 surcharge fee. This is an appropriate response to the Form PCT/DO/EO/905 mailed 02 June 2006. Applicants provided the petition fee for a small entity of \$750.00. Applicants' statement in the petition meets the requirement of 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). A terminal disclaimer is not required. Thus, all requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) are completed.

Applicants' petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(b)

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) requires (1) a petition fee, (2) factual proof that the inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be located, (3) a statement of the last known address of the inventor, (4) an oath or declaration by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant on behalf of and as agent for the nonsigning inventor, (5) proof that the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant has sufficient proprietary interest in the application, and (6) a showing that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damage.

Concerning item (1), the \$200.00 petition fee has been paid.

With regards to item (3), the last known address of co-inventor Paul Douglas is listed as:

17 Woodvile Road
Hartshorne, Derbyshire
DE11 7ET, United Kingdom

With regard to item (6), section 409.03(g) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) states that “[i]rreparable damage may be established by a showing (a statement) that a filing date is necessary to preserve the rights of the party or to prevent irreparable damage.” In the petition, the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant includes such a statement.

Thus, items (1), (3), and (6) of 37 CFR 1.47(b) are completed.

Regarding item (2), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant claims that the sole inventor, Paul Douglas, refuses to cooperate. Petitioner's burden in showing that an inventor refuses to cooperate is explained in section 409.03(d) of the MPEP. Several pertinent segments are listed below:

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made . . .

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. **If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. (Emphasis added)**

The "Witness Statement" by Mr. Martin Mark Neilson, indicates that a complete copy of the application was forwarded to Mr. Douglas on 04 September 2007. Petitioner states that the documents were delivered on 07 September 2007. A review of the evidence verifies that a complete copy of the international application was received by Mr. Douglas on 07 September 2007. Mr. Neilson also states that the attorney for Mr. Douglas (Walker Morris) has contacted them concerning the subject application and requests certain monies for Mr. Douglas's cooperation. However, petitioner has not provided copies of the correspondence with Walker Morris concerning the subject application. This evidence is required to make a determination whether a refusal to cooperate has occurred. *See above in bold.*

The 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must provide copies of all relevant correspondence between Mr. Douglas's representative and themselves with regards to the subject application in any renewed petition. For this reason, item (2) of 37 CFR 1.47(a) is not yet satisfied.

Regarding item (4), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant provided a declaration listing the name, residence, mailing address and citizenship of the sole inventor. The declaration was signed by Evan R. Witt, the attorney for applicant on behalf of the inventor. A power of attorney signed by the Director of Extec Screens and Crushers Limited was provided. This is not yet sufficient. Section 409.03(b) of the MPEP states that "[w]here the oath or declaration is being signed on behalf of an assignee, see MPEP § 324." Section 324 of the MPEP states, in part:

The submission establishing ownership must be signed by a party authorized to act on behalf of the assignee. The submission under 37 CFR 3.73(b) may be signed on behalf of the assignee in the following manner if the assignee is an organization (e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.):

(A) The submission may be signed by a person in the organization having apparent authority to sign on behalf of the organization. 37 CFR 3.73(b)(2)(ii) . . . A person having a title (manager, director, administrator, general counsel) that does not clearly set forth that person as an officer of the assignee is not presumed to have authority to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee.

(B) The submission may be signed by any person, **if the submission sets forth that the person signing is authorized (or empowered) to act on behalf of the assignee, i.e., to sign the submission on behalf of the assignee.** 37 CFR 3.73(b)(2)(i).

An attorney is not a position that is assumed to have the authority to sign for the assignee. Moreover, Mr. Witt has not set forth that he is authorized to act on behalf of the assignee. The power of attorney is not sufficient in this regard. As such, item (4) is not yet satisfied.

With regards to item (5), section 409.03(f) of the MPEP states, in part:

When an application is deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b), the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant must prove that:

- (A) the invention has been assigned to the applicant, or
- (B) the inventor has agreed in writing to assign the invention to the applicant, or
- (C) the applicant otherwise has sufficient proprietary interest in the subject matter to justify the filing of the application . . .

When an inventor has agreed in writing to assign an invention described in an application deposited pursuant to 37 CFR 1.47(b) a copy of that agreement should be submitted. If an agreement to assign is dependent on certain specified conditions being met, it must be established by a statement of facts by someone with first hand knowledge of the circumstances in which those conditions have been met. A typical agreement to assign is an employment agreement where an employee (nonsigning inventor) agrees to assign to his or her employer (37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant) all inventions made during employment. When such an

agreement is relied on, it must be established by a statement of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by the employee while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant.

Here, the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant claims proprietary interest in the above-captioned national stage application of PCT/GB2004/01183 because the inventor made the invention while he was an employee of INHOCO 2723 Ltd. (INHOCO) and had signed an employment agreement ("Agreement") transferring any invention to INHOCO. The 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant also submitted an extract confirming that INHOCO changed its name to Extec Holdings Limited on 18 February 2003. Extec Holdings Limited assigned its interest in the subject application to Extec Screens and Crushers Ltd. on 17 September 2007 (Exhibit N).

A review of the Agreement shows that it was dated 11 December 2002 and signed by Mr. Douglas. Section 14.2 of the Agreement provides that any invention created or discovered by Mr. Douglas in the course of the employment shall belong to INHOCO. The Witness Statement by Mr. Ian Frazier submitted as exhibit J states that "[t]he three US patent applications . . . name Paul Douglas as inventor or co-inventor, and have been derived from International patent applications made in the name of Extec . . . as applicant, also naming Paul Douglas as inventor." However, the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant has not provided a statement of a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts that the invention was made by Mr. Douglas in the scope of his duties while employed by the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant (or assignee).

The 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant also provided a copy of an assignment (Exhibit M) dated 31 August 2005 whereby Paul Douglas assigned all his interest in Extec Holdings Limited to Extec Holdings Limited. However, the above-captioned application was first submitted as a British patent application (0306492.0) on 21 March 2003. The assignment was not signed until 31 August 2005 and it is vague as to what intellectual property rights it encompasses. Thus, it is not clear whether this assignment applies to the subject application. A legal memorandum prepared by an attorney familiar with the law of the jurisdiction involved as discussed in section 409.03(f) of the MPEP may be required to certify that the subject invention was transferred to the 37 CFR 1.47(b) applicant.

For these reasons, item (5) is also not yet satisfied.

All of the requirements of 37 CFR 1.47(b) are not yet complete.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's petition under 37 CFR 1.47(b) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

10/550,035

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. No additional petition fee is required. Extensions of time are available.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James Thomson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "J" and "T".

James Thomson
Attorney Advisor
Office of PCT Legal Administration

Tel.: (571) 272-3302